2/8/95

Mr. Jennifer Prior
Carroll & Graf
260 Fifth Ave.,
New York, NY 10001

Dear Ms. Prior,

Herewith the answers an comments I can make to the copy editor's flagged questions for the last part of NEVER AGAIN!

Thinkign about the question, 589, asking for the "correct" name of Senator Longn which I took to mean which senator by that name, I quoted the memo verbatim and it does not make that identification. I think that of the alternatives, identying him as Seantor Edward Long, which might be correct, is the poorest because ti might not be correct.

Two alteratives are to leave the quote undistyubed or to add a note saying that which ~~of two~~ Senator Longs is not indicated. And the latter assumes what I do not recall Wither way, whether Russell Long then was still a Senator.

I appreciate that UPS was used this time. That meant although getting it too late to use it yesterday I was able to respond to each flag in time to make the morning mail this morning.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg

499 asks for JAMA page. As I explained before, getting this page citations is now impossible for me because I do not have access to our basement where, after two years, I had to move all of that for space in my office

500 Ditto

502 Ditto. This note also asks re lines 1 and 2 can 29 be changed to 28. I think this refers back to 500, the CBS broadcast of 1967, so OK.

503 - JAMA-ditto

505-Ditto

507 Ditto

513 Ditto

514 Ditto. I do not see the purpose of the other note opposite 11 lines up. It reads Per AFIP (check mark) when Blumberg was director from 1963-7, rank was Maj. Gen. But OK

515 JAMA ditto

516 JAMA ditto

525Ditto

526 Ditto

528 Ditto 528 529 Ditto

531 Ditto

535 In flipping the pages I notice that lines 6-9 were eliminated. This is not what I believe is normal copy editing and it denies the reader information the reader should have as should the record for history for later scholars. After four lines there is another such excision. I believe this is true also of the last excision on this page. I have said that I have the full steno transcript of Finck's New Orleans testimony but I here restrict myself to what I cite of it that I used in Post Mortem. This change thus makes the book appear to be drawing on all of Finck's testimony when it does not. It uses only what I used in PM.

536 JAMA ditto. My eye could not miss the extensive cut at the bottom half of this page so I read it and the cut through most of 538. This chapter is "Was There a Military Conspiracy?" Even if this in some ways might duplicate what I say elsewhere, and I do not believe it does, it belong here very much. It eliminates that the military controlled the autopsy absolutely! And that is an essential in this chapter and in the book and in history. Moreover, as this cut continues through page 537, how can mere copy editing remove the fact that the government got Boswell to go to New Orleans prepared to be a witness for the Clay Shaw defense? While at this point I can do nothing about it I believe this is not copy editing by any standard, is very wrong, should never be done without the consent of the author, hurts the book and makes much less of a record for out history of it than it would have been. I have no idea how many of these thay may be because I'm just turning pages to get to the clipon notes. This is editing

content and that is Not "copy" editing. I also, being able to do nothing else about it, record the fact this and anything else like it violates the agreement we reached on the editing anout a year and a half ago, in writing. I see in turning to the next clipon note that much more of this is done. I regard it as wrong, as very wrong and as interfering with the content and what this book and this particular chapter say about the possibility of a military conspiracy.

544 JAMA ditto

545 ditto

546 In turning the pages I see that all but four lines of this page have been eliminated. What is eliminated begins by addressing the reasons for which the military could have or would have taken control, if the autopsy and then goes into them. Same is true of 547-8. In eliminating the end page and a half of this chapter its conclusion was also eliminated. This happens also to have been a summing up of information for the reader on the matter.

552 The note reads "Earlier five inches of Connally's fourth rib!" The copy editor should change the earlier reference to make it the same as this. This is correct. I do not have access to the transcript of Dolce's interview so to confirm my recollection I checked the Warren Report. It says fifth on page 92.

557-8 In turning pages I see that copy editing also includes eliminating what the author regards as important with respect to Arlen Specter, who arranged the corruption of our history with regard to the medical and ballistics and related evidence, to eliminate reference to how he did the same thing to make Clarence Thomas a Justice of the Supreme Court. This is copy editing? Or is it becoming part of Specter's announced campaign for the presidency? This is part of a portrayal of the man who did what he did and then after profited politically from the deepest of possible subversions in a country like ours. This is among other things censorship, not editing, and as with the generals above, very, very wrong.

572 JAMA ditto

574 The note reads after reference to what Finck testified to, that they "were 'told not to' trace the path of the bullet through the body and therefore did not." Although I am rushing to be able to get this in today's mail I took the time to read back and through this. It refers to his New Orleans testimony. I now cannot retrieve that transcript to cite the page. I believe I used it in full earlier, and this gets to an earlier excision I noted above, that all I cited from that testimony is what I used of it in Post Mortem. only.

589 The note reads "Correct name of Long?" In checking back to see which Senator Long is referred to in what I have within quote, I see that on page 588 the sources of my direct quotation of Senator Russell is eliminated. But the JAMA articles, cited by date, need their page numbers? I have checked my office files on all those named a

and the cited record is not there. Not only do I now not have access to those files in the basement but because this is a direct quotation I believe that the FBI record did not identify which Senator Long. I do not recall when Senator Russell Long of Louisiana's term ended. Senator Edward Long of Missouri, much more liberal than Russell Long, was still in the Senate in 1968. Unless in the ms. there is an earlier reference to him, I think it would be better not to add Edward's name as I think is indicated in line 3 as to be done. From their political records it is more likely that Russell would be more anti-Warren that Edward and that Cuneo would be more likely from his politics to be close to Russell. Tamm's first name is not asked for and there were two brothers. The one referred to her is E.A., once a top assistant to Hoover and later a federal appeals court judge.

This is the last note. Because I believe there can be interest in the Afterword by the board that is to see to it that all assassination records are disclosed I turned to it to see if there are any excisions of what could be of interest to it. I find that on 749 what absolutely should not have been eliminated referring to the procedures of the HSAC was cut. Again, while I do not make an issue of it, I think it should be restored. If the consideration was space, this is of but 10 typed lines.

750- I think the short elimination of others getting records, two lines and one word, can be misused to reflect on me. I did not and do not want to present myself as the only one to force records from the memory hole and I was not alone. By the time this book appears it is likely that a committee will have more pages than I do.

751 Likewise my credit to Lesar for handling those lawsuits when I could not pay him.

756 Changes a name within quotes where the man was given as "Marian" and my four lines of explanation. This is wrong for several reason. One is that the direct quotation is from and reflects on the HSCA. It reflected their carelessness among other things. Also eliminated is the identification of Canning. I now do not remember why I included his name when it is not within what I quote. It is not impossibke that he was there and is cited asking a question or answering one.